

to be proofed

Note punctua.
especially.

M 1373

San Francisco - Group III

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. Nyland: Well, when last time - that was two weeks ago we talked about work and Gurdjieff and so forth and I was under the impression that well if they can take that they'll come back because I don't want to mince any particular words - after all the reason for having a group like this I've said before is with Gurdjieff in the background but sooner or later you'll have to know what really interests us and that even if we may talk about ordinary affairs of life it always will be with that background brought forward a little bit more every once in awhile - what to do about our life and to what extent would it be possible that work on oneself can be of help, and so now you come and maybe more than we had last time, and although we might assume that there are some people who are new and don't know about this other meeting we will continue in exactly the same way. whatever questions you might have we try to go a little bit deeper or to the bottom of it if we can the essential value of it and try to look at it from the standpoint of to use a big word objectivity. What are we going to do with this group after I leave - It is still a problem I mentioned it and we've said in the beginning for the time being when I am here we'll have these groups that is at the same time that interest - I'm sure that is here and there it ought to be continued and we have to find some people who are willing to undertake that kind of responsibility. For those who really want to find out more about work there's always the Berkeley group and there is a Palo Alto group and you can go there but that does not solve the problem for those who live in San Francisco and it does not solve immediately the problem of open meetings or groups where people can come just to get a little taste so I

don't know yet how that can be solved - what questions are there tonight that we can talk about - don't forget about such questions they must not be too personal. They have to have a value in general because it is a fairly large group and you can not assume that people become interested in a very special question of your own so if you try to adhere to that maybe we can have some questions.

question: Can you delineate the difference between being possessed by will and having will?

Mr. Nyland: Well we have to determine first what you mean by being possessed by will - in the first place what is a will

question: I know that

Mr. Nyland: Let's call it a wish - some kind of a desire - a will is usually strong - a will comes from the totality of a person - a wish can come from different parts of himself and the wish of course can be stronger - when there are in our terminology more than one center involved in it if the three centers of which man is made that is made up that is for the sake of elucidation we simply call it three centers - if they all combined in one desire it becomes a will when it is executed by the physical body, also to some extent of course when intellectually I become engaged in thoughts and emotionally I actually conduce my emotions and they could become active it may be the result of a will - now if you say possessed by will I don't know what you mean. Each person has of course a certain desire every once in awhile for something and the desire may be so strong that he can not resist it - if that's a question of possession as if one is possessed by that kind of a desire then of course it is a function of wherever it comes from. That depends then on what of the other centers will be able to consider such a desire that is if the desire is a

physical one both your mind and your feelings can have their ideas about it - the desire may exist as far as the body is concerned but fortunately a man is not made up entirely of a body - if there are thoughts one can have in the brain other thoughts which may be contrary to the thoughts that occupy you at the present time and that even if certain thoughts come to your mind you may be able to have with other thoughts simply tell yourself don't let's think about it - as far as feeling is concerned if I have a feeling and that is expressed as a desire it may be a feeling let us say for wanting to create or a feeling of religiousness or a feeling that tends to become philosophical the mind also has a chance to judge if such a feeling is for that moment at the right place and if I can fulfill it or if I can follow it up so then it becomes a question of conflict between that what may be desire in one center or a desire in the same center opposing it or desires in other centers opposing the first one and then it is a question who wins out - now if it is a matter I can consider with my mind I will bring to the foreground many things that I consider if I followed the desire that then the consequences are such and such and may be the consequences are not desirable and that may lead to opposing the desire and not attend to it or at least try to eliminate it but if the desire is very strong sometimes the thoughts will not help it will not oppose it and the feeling has sometimes very little to say so that then if it is desire on the part of the body the body simply fulfills whatever its desire is and takes the consequences. To what extent you can call it possession is simply a matter of how much opposition there is at the time you have the desire - if there is none you are possessed but if there are other contrary desires there may be a balance

and you are not possessed. You see you have to be clear first as I say if it is will it's an entirely different question because then the three centers act together and there is no chance of anyone really to oppose it so a will is very strong - a will is a determination - it is something that can overcome obstacles that has nothing to do with that what may be in the way and simply follows whatever this will wherever it comes from it is convinced that it is doing the right thing - There may be a little voice here and there in my thought that perhaps the will should not be as strong as all of that but I am then in the real sense possessed by a will because a personality possesses the will. If you put it on a different basis that if a man living on Earth has possibilities of being affected by certain influences which are not of this Earth or not of his body or personality then of course you can assume that if such influences exist that they may enter into the body or into the personality and that the personality becomes possessed by that kind of a thought or feeling or even the wish for activity but I don't think you meant that. You see we go then in the direction of being possessed by the devil - being possessed by spirits - being possessed by your grandfather - being possessed by a religious idea - being possessed by the possibility of love for God and things of that kind. Does that clarify it a little - because if it isn't you have to be more specific. Yah.

Question: Is Work like a path or how is work if it is like a psychoanalytical method, is it like a psychoanalytical method or is it -

Mr. Nyland: No. I would call it a form of psychology because it has to do with the mind and the functioning of it but I don't think

it resembles psycholog-psychology in the sense of having a method of psychoanalysis because it has to do with the present and psychology and psychoanalysis has to do with the past. In psychoanalysis you keep on thinking with your ordinary brain, you accumulate facts about yourself mostly based on the experiences you have had based in your past, past life and it is a form of thinking in which one collects a great many data which because they are then joined together in some way or other - you try to find a way out of what is related and what isn't and then what's determined at the time when one had an experience what were the factors that were involved and which one was bigger or more influenced than another and gradually out of that one distills certain let's say rules or ways of behaviour which are dependent on the experience and registration of that experience as I now recall it. For that it is very good to establish of course self knowledge and particularly when a person being the type he is is of course subject to the rules of that type there is whatever he may be - he is built up in some way or other and usually his education or whatever he has been exposed to has left certain influences in him which are either because of experiences or because he adapted them have given him characteristics so I try to determine then what is me - myself having certain character traits which become obvious or which at least expressed under certain conditions so it has to do with a thought pattern and a feeling pattern and the more I will know of how I will react what I will do in my form of behaviour under conditions which I've already had or even if they are new that the type that I represent will react in a certain way the more knowledge I will get about myself and that sometimes may give one an insight that certain things

were the results of something else so if something else again comes as a condition then perhaps there is a certain desire to avoid them and I think that within certain limits one can of course profit by the experiences of the past - The difficulty however is that if I go against certain things that are a little habitual and I do it with my ordinary mind I try to divert the energy which used to go in a certain expression in another way or I prevent it from going anywhere and I am stuck with it because it is energy that has to be used and if it doesn't find an outlet it might also create other difficulties so I do run a risk - I can stop of course the expression of certain emotions or feelings I have and I can tell with my mind don't express it - I can have thoughts in my mind in playing poker and I have a poker face which does not allow me to express on my face what kind of a hands I have - what kind of a hand of cards I have but in any event I will be able within certain limits to come to conclusions that certain things are right or wrong and then I use a pattern which has been established in accordance with ordinary civilization in which I ought to behave normal like everybody else and that allowances of certain aberrations from that is usually a little bit frowned upon - but you see it attacks the question completely from the standpoint of subjectivity of man as he is of man he can change within his surroundings he can change his personality and behaviour but nothing new is really introduced and only a little bit of wisdom and accumulation of more data. That's as far as psychology and psychoanalysis go to (concern?) () As far as work is concerned it is entirely different - In the first place I don't use my brain the way it is being used now - I try to find out if the brain, that is if the mental functioning of myself is capable of fulfilling a certain function

which I call objectivity - it simply means that what is the brain if it could function in that sense would function on its own entirely separate from any of the other centers - it would really start to function the way it ought to function because if it is a separate entity it should not be interfered with by any of the other centers of myself - For instance if I have a thought I can not act on the thought but many times I do because my mind functions that way and immediately when I have a thought I will act on it in accordance with what I think - I can prevent it if I have a feeling it is extremely difficult not to express it physically - I would like to have a feeling all by itself but I just can not do it because I need the body for expression since I have never learned the language of emotions. If I have a thought and my feeling is opposing it then my feeling will enter into the thought and the thought is not pure anymore as soon as something of a feeling enters into that when the thought should remain entirely intellectual. The function of the brain is the collection of data in such a way that I can be sure that the data are correct. The brain itself is at fault because as soon as I receive any kind of a thought or an impression through my sense organs then I immediately will start to classify it or associate it with previous thoughts and then in my memory when I try to recall them it may not be entirely correct because I say my memory may fail and also the thoughts may not be very agreeable to me for my own personality or my own welfare or even that I don't want to spend the time on it because I think they are superficial or that the thoughts may be such that I really can not live with them and I like to get them out of my mind and not consider them any further. All of this takes place of course in the brain itself - the brain is of

course made up of a variety of different mental functions and whenever anything is received as an impression from the outside again through the sense organs it is immediately subject to all kinds of interpretations and formulations even sometimes weighing them as far as their heaviness is concerned but mostly associative and when it is toward that way and that when now I happen to think about it now again or even at the time when I receive it, immediately my feeling comes in and says I like it or I don't like it. This means simply that the thought becomes prejudiced and it is not pure and for that reason since it is affected by a variety of other influences I never can be sure that the thought I have will be the same tomorrow or was the same ten years ago and in general we know well enough that the thoughts I have and that I now consider so called truthful are subject to change and I do not know what may have changed them - sometimes I say new experiences give me new light but that does not mean that the original one that I had was not valuable at that time and therefore if I am aiming at trying to get thoughts as facts about myself mostly and later on about the surroundings that then I want to make absolutely sure that such facts when they are received will be like that once and for all and keep the value which I now assign to them so for that reason and knowing well enough by experience that three centers as a whole are connected and that in my ordinary personality I even put a premium on it and when I say that the three centers are so complete that I am an entity and make an impression to the rest of the world as if I am one complete unit it is so far from the truth because to use simply a little terminology that Ouspensky has of the different kinds of I's which according to him don't know very much about each other which naturally is nonsense - I know very well that when I

say 'I' that I say it and I remember also that when I make a promise to myself and tomorrow morning I don't fulfill it that I did make a promise - I am not that forgetful and each little I - each particular facet of a personality knows very well what the other facets are of the same personality even if they go by the same word I. Now the question is if it is a little chaotic and if I then can not depend on what I think and it is much worse with my feelings because I can not even formulate them and I go by hunches and I assure you I am not always correct so that when I now face the problem how can I make this mind function in the correct way and how can I make my emotional center function correctly so that it doesn't need a physical expression then I am really up against how to separate the three centers from each other so that Work on oneself begins with the idea that I would like to have part of my mind at least start to function in an independent way from the rest of the mental functions and I express it by simply using the word objectivity because that what takes place at the present time the personality and in each of the centers are all so called ordinary subjective functions and by subjective I mean simply that what I am as a personality - all the manifestations - all the thoughts - all the functioning of all the organs in my body and whatever they may be - all is subjective - it is simply a term of indicating that man is on earth and that everything that happens on earth happens to be subjective when it concerns a human being. So when I say that this is not the right kind of condition and I would like to establish something that is more reliable then I have to get away from subjectivity - I call it objective although I can not really define what is meant by objectivity and I define it in a more or less negative way by saying everything that

is not subjective ought to be objective and the very fact that I think about objectivity means that I will believe that there is a possibility of having something which is non subjective to me - in line with that wimply means that that what is now connected as centers I would like to have some method by which they can be separated from each other and if they actually could function correctly for themselves and stay by themselves and if then they could be full grown and develop in such a way that the ultimate of such development has been reached that then there might be a possibility that at a certain time facing the outside world the three centers could be connected in such a way in accordance with whatever the requirement might be for the particular occasion and that I simply call harmonious and that what happens then to man is that he functions as a harmonious man - Work now means that I start with my intellect to try to understand first what is meant by work and then having in mind to develop a mental function or at least part of my brain which could become objective to myself I limit completely all so called impressions that I get from the outside world and objectivity in the beginning has nothing to do with becoming objective to the rest of the world - it is a consideration of myself the way I am and the way I now know I function that then in that way not liking it particularly because it is not correct I try to introduce an element which will give me the freedom from subjectivity - work then becomes an attempt to create something that could function objectively regarding myself. This in the terminology of Gurdjieff is called an I and for practical purposes I assume that this I in the beginning is an ordinary intellectual function but only functioning intellectually - that is it has to record facts because that is the function of an intellect to record

it and to store it - the facts I wish to record have to be truth so that there is no further question about it anymore after I have received that kind of an impression - it has to be always that way and whenever I recall it with my memory I have to have reliability that is there, was there and will be there in the future. This I call an absoluteness of the truth and the truth must of course be absolute otherwise it is not useful - if there is one truth for you and another for me we'll never come to terms so truth has to be universal and I say simply absolute - I mean by that not subject to any subjectivity - not subject to any interpretation - not subject to any liking or disliking and one says simply that what is truth and what I now perceive is the acceptance of a fact as it is without wishing to change it and without reinterpreting it without having any personal opinion about it without classifying it and pigeon-holing it because that would be associative and all these things now I will try to assign to something that functions as an objective faculty regarding myself - this we call I - the problem is that what I now think and what I feel and even if I have a wish for objectivity I do this in my subjective state I can't help it not having anything objective I have to project something that is functioning objectively but since it is made up of my thought and my real wish to create it in the beginning it will not really have an existence but I create it as if it exists and by that I mean that although it may not have reality it will start to function as if it is real and then when it functions it can receive facts about myself when they are received in this particular way. This process we call an observation process and that what has to be included is impartiality so as to exclude from the facts which are received any kind of a feeling I may have about them and the third

requirement is that what is received intellectually has to be completely free from any interpretation - now I call this simultaneity, instantaneousness and it is a rather difficult concept because my mind as it is at the present time doesn't know very much about a moment simply because that what comes to me and that what goes away I recognize as future and becoming past and there is no question that it goes through me as I am now existing receiving all kind of impressions. As soon as they reach me and they are located in my brain they disappear again into the past - they are retained as memory but I don't recognize them at the moment actually when I am affected by them - I think it is a fairly obvious way of looking at a brain and what kind of questions you can find out for yourself that really there is a little time elapsed because before that when you actually perceive and that what you happened to think about and lodged in the rest of your brain as a memory - Now this question of living you might say in a moment of receiving impressions at a certain time and immediately recording them - if that can take place it is a new function of the brain and in that new function there are no possibilities of any other mental functioning affecting it simply because all of them belong to something that is either the future or the past - all of them are subjective and I introduce now objectivity in the brain by saying that what takes place must be recorded at the same time and this I mean by simultaneity or a moment registration of that what takes place. Now these three requirements observation in the correct way means that it has to be impartial it simply means the collection of impartial facts in that what is the objective faculty and that those facts also have been registered in the moment whenever they happened when these three different requirements are fulfilled I can

rely on on that what the little 'I' receives as now having recorded facts which are truthful to the greatest possible extent because there is no further question about that when they are subject to these kind of requirements because all the requirements indicate a possibility of objectivity - The difficulty as far as this is concerned is not very great although in the beginning it is an as if and it comes from my subjectivity the fact that it will receive objective facts gradually make out of the as if a condition of reality because there is still reality when the facts are actually real that will be received by the little 'I' that the little 'I' will also start to become real and it is a changeover from an as if into a reality of existence which of course is a known fact. That in general is work and you see immediately that it has nothing to do with thinking about oneself and it is detailed in as far as what is work as applied and what do I do and what is the particular road I must take and to what extent do I now observe what and for what reason do I observe manifestations of the body only and so forth - those are questions of detail but the principle is there. You understand what I mean: Psychology is as useful as astrology and sometimes I think astrology is even more useful but it will only get me subjective data.

Question: Would being able to recognize subjective data help with work? That is knowing how...

Mr. Nyland: I think they can be used but since they are subjective they have a certain coloration so if I base my facts on - the collection of facts on anything which is subjective I mix up my memory partly it will have objective facts and partly subjective and I would almost say that they would get in the way - both of course are recorded when one works and you establish something that becomes objective your unconscious mind will continue to function -

you can't help that because the personality will continue to live and for that reason it will keep on thinking, keep on feeling - it will be active all in an unconscious way but that what is recorded now at the present time which makes my memory certainly are maybe subjective facts and they are in the memory and they will continue because I don't exclude ordinary life but the objective road is parallel to that what is now subjective and on its own objective road will give me facts which are objective facts so that the memory becomes filled with two things - subjective and objective facts - if I now recall them and actually if I can separate what was received objectively and what was received subjectively naturally for the possibility of growth I will take that what is objective because it is more reliable - don't let's go too much in detail because it doesn't affect principles and it belongs of course to the actuality of working and how to classify certain things in the proper way so that they become useful. No - subjectivity in that particular aspect of objective working doesn't help you much but you do know from your subjective behaviour more or less and the way one is and also the recognition of certain types that one is this and that and then behaves under certain conditions in a certain way - one is then able if one becomes interested in the objective fact of that kind of behaviour that one can see it quite plainly for whatever it is and also can explain it and perhaps foretell but you still have the difficulty even if you know a little bit about yourself that it is a question of acceptance yourself as you are without any like or dislike or further associations so you run up against exactly the same difficulty - it doesn't make any difference you see. Have you read anything about Gurdjieff?

Question: I read Ouspensky about Gurdjieff and a short book by/ on

Rodney collin.

Mr. Nyland: Well read something by Gurdjieff himself. I said it before if you want to find out something go to the source - don't rely on people interpreting it for you. All and Everything is the book that you want to read - you should. Other questions? **Yah.**

Question: Could you give me an example of an impartial fact and ?

Mr. Nyland: Well let's say if you consider an observation the way you walk that there is a body walking without any particular aim in the mind and simply moving one leg in front of the other and moving that way one can at a certain time understand that there is absolutely no reason why you want to change your walk and also that having done it so often that there is nothing beautiful about it that you want to admire so for the purpose simply of walking not even having in mind that you want to go and get something but you simply walk up and down or as I say sometimes that you carry an empty suitcase that there is absolutely no rhyme or reason than only to walk and have the body walk - there is a possibility that during such a little period something in you is actually objective to the fact of this body walking - I think that there are many times that one really can become quite objective to oneself in certain manifestations when there is no particular attachment or no involvement or when there is no associations with it - that is if I move my arm it doesn't make any difference if I move it left or right where there is no reason for moving it but if I wish to move it for the sake of moving it I can become aware of that movement and this process of working in accordance with the three principles I enunciated simply means that that what is taking place in the mind I call an awareness and if that moment of awareness is continued

it becomes a state which I call being awake - This is what Gurdjieff would call that something in one's mind is developed as consciousness and this consciousness having to do with oneself one uses the term self consciousness as different from that what is ordinary conscious or unconscious which we use in ordinary life.

Question: There is another thing I wanted to ask you about, you separate feeling facts from intellectual facts and I don't understand how that can happen.

Mr. Nyland: Well if you think mathematically there is a great deal that you do intellectually without having any feeling - you know one tries to become quite logical - logic many times can be without any particular feeling - you really don't want it because if it affects it it starts to affect the valuation of the facts - now in general I think that whatever I look at whatever I hear I immediately classify in some way or other and by association - there is usually a like or dislike connected with it - where it takes place is another question - in all probability there are certain effects from the feeling center which are registered in the thalamus and the hyperthalamus in the brain and because of that kind of a combination of mental activity any kind of a fact that is received or perceived is subject to a mental association and to an emotional placement to like or dislike. You look at someone and see what happens to you - that is you look and see that so and so has a dirty face and there goes a thought through your mind that so and so should not have a dirty face and you really don't like. You take your food and it smells a little badly and you don't like it and it's an ordinary sense organ that gives you the fact that it doesn't smell right but the early association of

food and smell in that way was someplace simply that you didn't like and you **even** could throw up - any kind of a thought you have that simply affects you because you have already had one before and that was associated in some way or other with an experience of your own immediately comes back to you and there is immediately without almost not taking any particular time - associations are very quick and at a certain moment when I see something I have already a whole story present for that what I am seeing. Go through your own experiences of daily life and see what happens to you and see if actually in your brain you can separate that from whatever is a feeling I say they are possibilities of course and naturally whenever I say I walk and I am habitually doing this and that even my brain doesn't take part in it but the body takes part. It comes to a state very soon that I do it automatically - but in an automatic behaviour there is very little life - automatic simply means that there is a customary way of behaving with one center and the other two centers don't take a part so I can not mean automatism because that doesn't engage the total man - I want to make sure that that what I receive I receive as well as I can - if I receive it only with one center only a certain part of me takes part in it and when the functions are there and they have to be adjusted to that what is my experience in receiving impressions I want to make sure that I extract from the impression everything that is possible to extract from it but I also want to make sure that what is my impression and it is being extracted that it is done without interference from any one of the other three centers that each one has a chance because as soon as there is interference there is a possibility of mixing it up and then one or the other is not pure - you understand what I mean - many times it's a question of definitions because some people may prefer

to have the feeling and the thought be mixed.

Question: Yeah. But now you are talking about when each of the centers experiences an event separately and then you are talking about harmony somehow -

Mr. Nyland: Well I simply give a little perspective to the reason why one wants to have in the first place the centers function separate from each other - it is not in order to continue to have them function in that way - the purpose is that they can become combined whenever it is necessary all three in a more harmonious way - not automatically - you see? It is that reason it is now connected but it is connected automatically based on a variety of different things that have affected me without sometimes any rhyme or reason or simply the associative forms are based on education which has given me many clichés which are really not my own - I want to make sure that that what I am doing is correct at any one time and when I find out that I behaved differently and sometimes I can not do anything about it and then I start to question the way I am - is it really the right way and if I am changeable and become less and less dependable and have activities which I can not control then I see that I am sometimes completely like a chicken without a head and I am unconscious and is that the kind of behaviour a man - a real man - should be or should actually show - you see it is to some extent the dissatisfaction I have with my behaviour as I noticed it and whatever I now happen to think or feel about it and I can imply that I would like to rationalize naturally that I want to be able to live with myself but there are certain facts - I know I fly off the handle without any rhyme or reason I can not stop it I get angry because even the fact of so and so who has done me dirt ten years ago I'll never forget whenever I see him I feel like kicking him again. I mean auto-

matic reactions of a person completely uncontrolled and we know it mean of course someone steps on my toe of course I swear - there's no question about it - someone pushes me, I push them unless I am very polite and I'm not always - but you see that was only perspective - that if the three could be separate then there is a possibility of connecting them in such a way that the totality is harmonious - it does not mean equal one third and one third and one third - certain situations will require very little of the body but it may require tremendous amount of the intellect and may be very little of feeling but I think that all three have to be there to represent that what is a person - All right?

Question: Mmmhmmm.

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Question: What are the lines of separation of intellect and emotion and what value do you assign to the value of the myth as a symbol of workings or the natural shall we say material for the higher centers? Do you assign a value or do you suggest that each is relevant to each center ?

Mr. Nyland: Well it's always a question does it exist or not - if it does not exist it has to be brought into existence and for that I need material that is even if it is a question of growing I have to feed that what can grow - I can not expect that when something exists let's say it this way the question of existence for me simply means that it is within my realm that I can see it or touch it or feel it or know that it exists for me - if it doesn't exist in that way it still may exist but since I don't know anything about it it does not exist for me for practical purposes - it is exactly the same as saying that what is now embryonic, might grow out and then have value for me - as it is at the present

time it has no value because it is not grown up enough - so the problem is on the one hand that what I at the present time assume that it exists in embryo and that it has to grow out is exactly the same as that the assumption that that what exists is not available to me and that I gradually would like to uncover it. Now the question of this kind of growth depends on the kind of material it is being fed - if it is a question of development of a higher being body in the terminology of Gurdjieff there is either the Keesdjanian or a Soul body. They are of a certain materiality which at the present time I really don't possess because there may be certain substances in me in every body which are of higher kind and perhaps there is something that I say this is the highest form of energy for me and still it is too low to create certain conditions which a body would represent if it is of lighter density. You see - it again depends on how you determine whatever is the difference between these higher being bodies and that what we understand by material appearance of a man in his physical - in his physical way. Physically speaking the highest energy that a man has is sex - there is no higher energy no energy are used for his intellect and for his feeling center and a great deal of material is simply used for the maintenance of his physical body - not for the organs - sex energy being of a high quality for man is useful for the procreation and making new bodies - it also can be used for the purpose of creation of higher being bodies provided a man knows how to convert it and that what is the density required for such higher being bodies is of greater - of less dense of greater lightness than that what sex energy is and the process of Work that is when one is Working and at that time receives impressions in a conscious state creates physiological conditions in the body which then enable that

what is sex energy to be converted into a higher form of a of a material - you can say that this is to some extent a theory and do not assent it is not because I know well enough that certain states particularly emotionally and intellectually as I now experience will effect the condition of the physical - the physical condition of my body and there will be certain glands functioning in a high emotional state which don't function when I am not emotionally involved and the same intellectually. Now it is quite easy to conceive that if the intellect starts to function in a conscious way that certain conditions take place in the body which were not there before and which will change physiological, physiological relationships and that then they affect that what is energy in the totality of the body and particularly when there is a wish for creation that then then what will be used is that what is energy also used for creation, although it may be on a mundane plane.

Question: Would you say it is possible to teach by myth in the same way as one could teach by symbol

Mr. Nyland: Teach by what?

Question: Teach by the use of myths, myths just as for the same way one could teach by symbols

Mr. Nyland: Of course you can. The only question is how do you digest what you receive - if I think about a myth or a symbol or if finally the myth starts to penetrate and become emotionally involved or when I see what is really a symbol and you might say with that increased insight I become emotionally at a little higher level it will change me - the question is how much can I actually use for the purpose of further growth or is it simply a development of that what is already there intellectually or emotionally - you see that is really where the separation has to be made

because that what is me as I am emotionally or intellectually @ although it is a question of growing out from what already starts or has started and is partly embryonic and partly a little bit on the road of development it has reached the point where naturally or subjectively it doesn't seem to go further and no amount of associating and having myths can penetrate into me or associating with symbolisms or going through certain higher states of emotions as far as my ordinary feeling is concerned will ever get me across the question of becoming free from them. You see the ultimate aim is freedom - freedom from subjectivity - when I am affected by anything I read anything I hear anything that affects me either intellectually or emotionally I sharpen the functions that I have and exactly because I am affected by them I remain identified with them and this is the greatest difficulty and it is a question again of definition because I may prefer this and I can say yes, if I wait long enough if I am able to exclude all energies going in any one direction but concentrating with energy only for one direction that then totally there is enough for me to reach a great height in the development. If I would take in myths or symbols and constantly spend my time all energies in trying to find out what they mean and actually in that way digest them at the expense of all further intellectual endeavors at the expense of all activities physically I would be able with this kind of a feeling and emotion to reach a state which is tremendously far away from earth - it is exactly the same as mythical involvement or if I by means of becoming a Saint separate myself from the rest of the world and there is absolutely no question that a person if he wants to do that can actually reach that and he says he reaches God or he reaches eternity or he reaches some kind of an

endlessness which is for him satisfactory because that is where he fuses and disappears - so you see that's not excluding that possibility but if one does it what has become of man. He is not a man anymore - he has become just a one centered entity with the concentration of all energies in that one direction but the man is not there - he may become a Saint and he may reach the height that he wishes as far as he is concerned but how does he know if in doing that he is fulfilling the function for which originally he was born - we are not born with one center only - no one - every person has three centers because that is a human being and I do not know I do not know why a person is born that way unless I will assume that that what he is born with has to be put to a certain test and if it is considered as a talent it has to be developed and if I develop only one one center and neglect the other two I don't think I fulfill my function as a man but again I say it's a question of definition.

Yah.

Question: How do you distinguish between objective self awareness and uncomfortable self consciousness?

Mr. Nyland: and the what?

Question: the uncomfortable self consciousness

Mr. Nyland: the uncoverable self consciousness? You said uncovering-

Question: Uncomfortable self consciousness.

Mr. Nyland: Uncomfortable?

Question: The times when you are aware of yourself and you begin to feel very uncomfortable about it -

Mr. Nyland: Are you really?

Question: (ous)?

Mr. Nyland: Well you know self awareness if you understand it well

if that means non identification - if it means impartial it certainly can not mean that you become uncomfortable - if you are uncomfortable you don't do it right. Try to understand first what is meant - something in me observes something of me I call it 'I' - it is as if outside - it is as if now it is functioning independently from the rest of my brain - in any event its this little 'I' tries to observe me - it will accept that what I am - it will then exclude partiality - it will also try to do it at the same moment when it happens - now if I am uncomfortable that is unconsciously uncomfortable that what is the little 'I' is not observing in the proper way - it's just a little thought I have - it's a contradiction in terms you see? If there is awareness it has to be awareness in the real sense - if somehow or other I have an experience and I say it is a result of awareness and I am uncomfortable I make a mistake. Start with ordinary things so that there is no question of being uncomfortable or not. When I start walking walking up and down if you you might say consider your face - there is nothing uncomfortable about the expression of your face. When you are alone you become uncomfortable you contort it someone else looks at it and he dislikes you for it but of course that is not the question - when I have a face under any kind of condition and when I wish to become aware of it I choose a time when no one else is looking - close your eyes and move your hand and your arm and become aware of the movement. Nothing uncomfortable in that - still it can lead to an awareness of your arm keeping your eyes closed and you move different limbs and maybe you will become aware of the existence of yourself - you can be aware of your breathing you can be aware of the tensions whatever may be in your body's stiffness aware of the state in which it is without

really disliking it but simply that what is the state reminds you that it exists and all we are interested in the fact of objectivity is the fact that of our existence - the further I go the more objective I can be the less I can see detail I have no interest because I can not even see it. Try to get straight first what is meant by Work otherwise you will run up against all kinds of difficulties alright. Moreover I would say even if it is a little uncomfortable but it gives you something it is probably worth while paying for it. No the uncomfortable part is that you don't want to Work and that sometimes gives you the idea that perhaps you should and you don't do it and that is uncomfortable. Yah.

Question: In what sense...

Mr. Nyland: I don't hear you well

Question: In what sense are children closer to objectivity?

Mr. Nyland: I think that children when they are young are not as yet spoiled as we say - they are uninhibited - they don't have as thick a layer of civilisation as we have - they have not been educated in as much as we have they have not that kind of a protection or that kind of a covering I think a child also is not so completely connected in all three centers I think they are a little bit freer in the movement without any particular mind or a feeling - it depends what age you stop being a child I'm talking about a child in the very early period up to two years at most - as soon as they get past that and they start to function in an ordinary way like a so called grown up man although he is still small and we teach them to behave like father and so forth and we also introduce this element of considering themselves I instead of little willie wants this and willie wants that. You see the question of objectivity for a child when he can consider himself like someone

really disliking it but simply that what is the state reminds you that it exists and all we are interested in the fact of objectivity is the fact that of our existence - the further I go the more objective I can be the less I can see detail I have no interest because I can not even see it. Try to get straight first what is meant by Work otherwise you will run up against all kinds of difficulties alright? Moreover I would say even if it is a little uncomfortable but it gives you something it is probably worth while paying for it. No the uncomfortable part is that you don't want to Work and that sometimes gives you the idea that perhaps you should and you don't do it and that is uncomfortable. Yah.

Question: In what sense...

Mr. Nyland: I don't hear you well

Question: In what sense are children closer to objectivity?

Mr. Nyland: I think that children when they are young are not as yet spoiled as we say - they are uninhibited - they don't have as thick a layer of civilization as we have - they have not been educated in as much as we have they have not that kind of a protection or that kind of a covering I think a child also is not so completely connected in all three centers I think they are a little bit freer in the movement without any particular mind or a feeling - it depends what age you stop being a child I'm talking about a child in the very early period up to two years at most - as soon as they get past that and they start to function in an ordinary way like a so called grown up man although he is still small and we teach them to behave like father and so forth and we also introduce this element of considering themselves I instead of little willie wants this and willie wants that. You see the question of objectivity for a child when he can consider himself like someone

else considers him is tremendously important and therefore immediately when you say 'Don't say little willie but say I want a piece of jam or a piece of bread' it's entirely wrong just contrary to objectivity - when a child is young and it is free and uninhibited and open it does not say thank you when you give him something it runs away because it is entitled to it - thank you is ordinary politeness - any form of politeness of telling children how to behave in a certain framework - you must not do this - you must not do that is quite contrary to letting them live their lives but of course they have to have guidance so you can not let them run around and let them do what they feel like because they'll fall off the table - you know there has to be some kind of a control to prevent them but you have to indicate to some extent in what direction they should go or perhaps they could develop with your aid and not leave it to them - If you want to play with the child that's beautiful but if you tell it to go ahead and play and you read the paper it's no good - when that age is that a child loses himself it's very difficult to determine - some children stay for a long time you might call it naive or innocent and it's a beautiful thing when it happens - the only difficulty is when they have to change over and actually are confronted with the rest of the world and the world is rather cold that then they get hurt and they have not adjustment enough and that prematurely they may have tasted of certain things they do not know how to place it - at what age this takes place it's very difficult to say - some children are protected - some are really in a little prison and because of that have not developed at all - some have and keep their let's call it naivete which is a beautiful something like intuition and they may take it for a long time and even they will at times keep it because the conditions are against them and

they become within themselves keeping that what is beautiful for them - it may be lost already when a child is four years old and it may still be in existence when they are twenty years - It's very difficult to say but usually you can assume that when they reach the age of five or six and when they associate with other children and go to school in order to get educated learned they have already have lost it and then it's extremely difficult to bring it back - it can be built at a great deal of cost.

Come all you people, what nothing special? Don't you - the tape still has to run a little bit - I can't stop.

Yah.

Question: What is prayer?

Mr. Nyland: You want me to answer you?

Question: Yes very much.

Mr. Nyland: In each person there is a duality. A person when he grows in his life after he has been born and let's say he is a little bit disallusioned not knowing it but growing up in a world like it's said that was cold a world of unconscious and well meaning people - a world which consists of the laws of gravity physically and psychologically - the world is based as we know it and as mankind at the present time lives it of habits of unconscious behaviour forms of certain ways in which a man has to behave in accordance with circumstances because the circumstances will not allow him to live his life and he has to conform to all kinds of ideas - some people rebel and they don't like it - they don't think it is right inherently in them there is something that says why should other people tell me what I should do In each person gradually there is developed the possibility that if he could grow in accordance with his own whatever his little conscious may be and that they don't really want to give up certain things they

believe in and that gradually they do give it up because they are not strong enough. There are some who will keep that what is for them essential and if this essentiality starts to develop that goes over into the possibility of freedom and wishing for that by of a development for themselves that if they only could live essentially and not be bothered by the outside world that then something of much more value could be retained by them. I say this is a duality and as one grows older there is much more chance of that what is really essential is pushed more and more to the background - in the first place one has so little time for it - in the second place one becomes a little ashamed even if it is mentioned - in the third place in order to feed it there are not enough people to tell you what to do about it - within themselves such people become very godlike essentially and they do at such a time remember even at the time when they were very small that something else was there and the recollection of that what they used to be they look back on as something they have lost - this kind of feeling can take hold of themselves - of them that is they want to encourage it and they want to have something to hold on regardless of whatever the rest of the world might tell them or whatever they experience and within their inner their inner life something starts to grow and a hope that some day there is a possibility of actually following that and to be able to throw away all the rest. Out of that a certain religion is born and the religion tries to express itself in certain ways and in certain words and religion need every once in awhile confirmation from others and because of that some people who try to think and feel in the same way connect and combine and then either they form a congregation and they have a church or they read religious books or they are affected by the conditions of life as

they are and they start to think and feel and then read about other people who have done the same kind of a thing and out of that they build for them a little bit of a life philosophy into which they try to pour something of their own and then it becomes their own conduct of life. Many times such a person realizing that what he really is, knows that it is all against him that everything of the outside world prevents him from being what he really wants to do - he tries to withdraw within himself and that is not allowed because no one can remain a hermit and no one can even afford it and that therefore he has to live in life the way he has to simply because he can not do anything else and he is afraid that something will be harmed within himself - when he wishes to protect this when he wishes actually to keep it he starts to pray because in that he believes that that what he really is can be communicated not to the rest of this Earth and it has nothing to do with any kind of a denomination of other people and it has nothing to do with anyone who has written about religion and those who are so called messengers from above who have talked and Christianity and Tibetanism and Buddhism and whatever it has nothing to do with him and he wishes to pray to something that for him becomes a he calls it God because he has no other name for it - it is a concept for him that he believes is free from this Earth and that in order to contact him that then there is a possibility that something comes down to assure him that that what he really is is correct and is essentially correct for him so that in the realization of that kind of a contact he becomes more and more at peace and at equilibrium with himself and knowing that that what is the highest for himself he is protecting to the extent that he actually can make that contact it may be very possible for him to have then

the satisfaction of knowing of something existing which then at certain times fuses with him and that at other times he knows how little there is of himself and for that he needs a little bit of more help and the only place he can hope for that some help can come is by taking on a prayerful attitude and even in stammering and wishing to have contact asking for help sometimes blessing on that what he is doing - it is a form or prayer in which he then wishes to lose himself in order to gain that what is the grace of the Lord - to what extent such people in general are successful that is successful in their prayer to what extent they believe that the prayer is heard to what extent they can continue to live even with the acknowledgement of God for them and to what extent even that God is the same kind of a God of other people it really doesn't matter very much because at a certain time when they have this particular kind of a need they know that they are not part of the world anymore when they pray and they pray then for the possibility of continuing that kind of a life independently of the world or sometimes they pray for the possibility that if they do die that they might go to heaven and then can forget about Earth altogether and forever - what it is that makes a man really pray - it is his felling his wish actually to become one with something that is higher than he is simply because inherently in man there is the realization that that what he is in the form which he now represents is not the finality and it is not real for him and it is not just for him that he as a man is born with this form of life on Earth - it is not that he dares to hate it but he rebels against the conditions which prevent him at the present time to become what he really should be and he knows that and in prayer he seeks for that kind of a help and that in the period when he does pray

and can pour out his heart out to the possibility of that God can help to protect me and look at him and take favor and that he as he is is acceptable and whichever form it will take and if one says I am a sinner and I need a mediator and Christ can help me or that I wish the assurance from a father confessor or that whatever is needed for me to go through a penance or whatever flagilante attitude I might have - all of that belong to this form for man to have in this life the assurance of infinity.

Question: The Christian church teaches the idea of resurrection

Mr. Nyland: Which church?

Question: The Christian Church

Mr. Nyland: Yes

Question: Resurrection after death

Mr. Nyland: Yes

Question: And I understand that the kind of teaching.....
what Gurdjieff has

Mr. Nyland: There is very little that Gurdjieff has said actually about that particular problem of what is life of what was it before one was born what is it after one dies that only to the extension that it is a possibility of inner life that he believes that if that could be developed there is a possibility then of not being subject to physical death - now what does happen what we call the in general spiritual existence of that what may even be an emotional possibility for a man to remain in existence after his physical body is no longer there or at least not useful - it simply means that there is a possibility of evolution for man in which he then in building certain things that are called by Gurdjieff his Keshjanian or his Soul body that this form of life that is now in his physical body can continue when the physical body is not there any longer - it means

simply that that what is life in man and this you might say is implied in what Gurdjieff is saying without saying it in so many words, that that ought to continue by means of Work as man now realizes that he has to build a Soul he has to realize that what is the vehicle in order to get to his Soul is an emotional something that could remain in existence after his physical is of no use anymore. It means simply that the continuation of life as he now knows it requires for him to have constantly a form in which this life can appear and then exist at certain places. It's a question of belief to what extent that what remains as a spiritual value has enough entity to continue to live and regardless of the condition in which it finds itself that it is not subject any longer to the laws of destruction as we know it on earth - if a man has a Kerdjianian body that is an emotional possibility for him to live in that then this Kerdjianian has also a certain purpose to serve as a stepping stone for the formation of his soul - the soul is the continuation of man at the moment when he actually dies going over into a body which has a definite quality which because of its quality is able to perceive God or is able to receive from God certain impressions that His endlessness is sending out in the form of life giving forces in the rest of the universe and if a man can believe and gradually verify for himself that life exists in other forms and for himself that the possibility exists for his life to continue to live that is that it never will be destroyed and that all that will be destroyed from time to time is the form in which it happens to be then of course the assumption that as I say gradually the verification is quite obvious that life of man as life is eternal so that then I can make this particular form of life do almost anything that is more conceivable for me or even more agreeable for me to accept and

I can believe and perhaps to some extent verify that something of me comes back again as a resurrection appearing on Earth in another kind of form never the less the same kind of a life I can also say that such Souls if they are fully developed will find a place in heaven and that then they are like angels or archangels and they serve his endlessness who sits on a throne I can also say that what is Soul for me still has to work through possibilities of further development that even if I reach a state of selfconsciousness that it is not all as yet because that what is the solar system in which I become self conscious is from the standpoint of the universe still a speck and that therefore my mind thinking about that what is space and what is time and what is the requirement for that what is the concept of infinity for me becomes a little bit woozy when I am now thinking about it but I hope that when I am free from what I now call perceptions of that what are organs in me which are sense organs when that freedom exists and I can live Kerdjianian or I can live as a Soul that then I will have Wisdom which at that time will tell me what is really required of me if I still represent this form of life it becomes quite immaterial because the assumption for me and also what I can verify of existing spirits which used to live on Earth and are now still in a spiritual world I think there is no stretch of the imagination that is really too big to assume that they continue because a person has within him at the present time certain spiritual values and that wherever they may exist after they leave the Earth close to the Earth or a little higher or whatever it is that their function is - we have enough facts to indicate that psychically such a thing is definitely possible and also actually exists - there is no question about it but aside from that how much use is it to me and to what extent can I now

project myself into such an existence and to what extent will I know how to behave now in order to prepare myself for that kind of an existence - that is very difficult sometimes it is a matter of belief and sometimes it is a matter of actually developing that same kind of a state that would exist if I had lost my physical body - you see that is really where the quintessence comes down to if I can create for myself conditions and by means of work can develop certain substances which are at the present time even being on Earth free from Earth then I duplicate the possibilities of what it will be afterwards when I actually will die and if there is something in me that I could consider my Soul and if this Soul could develop while I am still walking on Earth and that would mean that I walking on Earth am free from all the bondages of Earth that then simply it's a matter of transferring a form of energy which is representing my life into another kind of a body and that if such a possibility exists for development that man can be with a Soul on Earth and that for him death has no further meaning and only a changing over from one body to the other which every way one wants to philosophize about it as I say it doesn't really matter because that what does count is whatever such philosophies will mean to me in my desire to work now - if it simply is a matter of satisfaction of even hoping that after I die I will go to Heaven because God will be good to me and if that is satisfying for me at the present time of course I won't do anything about it I will remember when I die that God has told me I was his child but you see sometimes one is not always satisfied with that kind of a statement and one says you never can tell because maybe when I die God may be out - who knows you see and in order to take the certainty for the uncertainty I prepare because if I prepare then I'm sure God

must be there.

Yah.

Question: Gurdjieff was kinda fond of pulling tricks on well on somehow shifting the perspective of some of the people he came in contact with-

Mr. Nyland: How do you know?

Question: Well from what I've read..

Mr. Nyland: Oh. You believe them?

Question: Do I believe what I read?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Question: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Good then he had them

Question: Then he what?

Mr. Nyland: Then he had such tricks. You have to believe what you read. Do you ever question what you read?

Question: Occasionally

Mr. Nyland: I think in this case you ought to. I don't think Gurdjieff had tricks.

Question: Well well maybe that's a bad word I don't

Mr. Nyland: Oh. Let's use another word.

Question: There are certain instances where I don't know it was related to me that there was one instance where he saw some woman walking with an ice cream cone and he just flipped out and said something about wouldn't it be nice if it had mustard on it and she went back and got the mustard to put on it so then Oh get out of the institute ...

Mr. Nyland: Really? Well I will tell you I will add that to my bag of tricks.

Question: What I really wanted was actually some kind of a I was

wondering if you'd be willing to relate some kind of contact you had with Gurdjieff of which you have a particular memory of it.

Mr. Nyland: No I never had an icecream cone

Question: What know Gurdjieff?

Mr. Nyland: I never had an icecream cone. I don't remember any tricks of that kind. Yes, of course I knew Gurdjieff and let's forget about the tricks.

Question: I don't mean a trick I just mean a

Mr. Nyland: No about certain stupid fools. If it actually were so what would you do - put some mustard on an icecream - what would you do?

Question: Oh. I'd probably put mustard on the icecream.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Good. It serves you right. All kinds of stories and legends will be told about Gurdjieff because he was a strange person and he was quite outstanding and anyone who is really in that sense different from the rest - many people will try to reinterpret what they think he is but you see whatever he may have appeared to be in his life to the outside world he also was someone to those who have an inner world for themselves and the more they are interested in that the less they care about the outside appearance and maybe I don't know if he ever ate icecream himself if he did maybe he put mustard on it himself who knows? And what do I care.

Question: Yeah. but actually what I was getting at was I was wondering if you could relate some

Mr. Nyland: No No

Question: way you communicated with

Mr. Nyland: No Oh No

Question: enlightening to you in some way

Mr. Nyland: Oh yah there are many enlightening things about Gurdjieff that he indicated.

Question: Yean

Mr. Nyland: But why should I tell you

Question: I'm just ask

Mr. Nyland: To perpetuate gossip? No I have no interest in that

Question: Do you have anything to say about differences between men and woman?

Mr. Nyland: Oh. We have a lot to say about that.

Question: I guess what I want to ask you is are there differences between man and women, just...

Mr. Nyland: Didn't we already start with that subject some time ago. First meeting didn't we talk about it - there is a tape on it but you can bring it up next week - we will meet again next week if you wish and by that time we will know what we ought to do with the group so have a good week - I'll see you again - goodnight.

END TAPE

trans
proof